

REMARKS

Responsive to the Office Action mailed October 5, 2005, Applicants provide the following. The claims have been amended without adding new matter. Claims 1, 14, 18, 20, 24 and 25 have been amended, claims 26-30 have been added and claims 15-19 have been cancelled without prejudice. Twenty-five claims remain pending in the application: Claims 1-14, 20-29. Reconsideration of claims 1-14, 20-29 in view of the amendments above and remarks below is respectfully requested. New claims 26-30 have been added without adding new matter and are supported throughout the specification and figures at least in paragraphs 0039-0042.

By way of this amendment, Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain any outstanding issues, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

8. Claims 1-16, 20-23 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0064835 A1 (Bellwood et al.).

Applicants respectfully submit that Bellwood et al. does not teach every element of independent claim 1, and claims 2-13 depending from claim 1, in view of the detailed description. However, in order to expedite the application at this time, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 without prejudice or disclaimer to further distinguish the “event” described in Bellwood et al. from the event claimed. For example, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to include: “detecting content transmitted by a participant of the event”. These amendments have been made without adding new matter, and are supported throughout the specification in at least paragraphs 0039-0040.

Bellwood et al. relates to a media manager receiving content (e.g., a television program) from a content provider (e.g., the cable company), wherein the content includes event data packets that indicate when a certain event is happening on a television program. (See Bellwood, paragraphs 0028-0029 and FIG. 1). Accordingly, the content being transmitted to the user is by a content provider. (See Bellwood paragraphs 0028-0029 and FIG. 1). Thus, the

content is not being transmitted by a participant of the event as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants submit that all elements of amended independent claim 1 are not disclosed in Bellwood et al. Thus, independent claim 1, and claims 2-13 that depend on of claim 1, in condition for allowance, and the present rejection is overcome.

Applicants respectfully submit that Bellwood et al. does not teach every element of independent claim 14. However, Applicants have similarly amended independent claim 14 to include: “means for detecting content relating to the event and transmitted by a participant of the event”. As stated above, Bellwood et al. does not disclose content relating to the event being transmitted by a participant of the event. Therefore, for at least this reason, independent claim 14 is in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully submit that Bellwood et al. does not teach every element of independent claim 20, however, Applicants have similarly amended independent claim 20 to include: “an interface module to receive content and description information corresponding to the content, wherein the content is relating to an event is captured and transmitted by a participant of the event”. Bellwood et al. does not disclose a system where a content categorization module categorizes content that was captured and transmitted by a participant of the event. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Bellwood et al. does not anticipate independent claim 20, or claims 21-24 that depend off of claim 20, and therefore, claims 20-24 are in condition for allowance.

Similarly, independent claim 25 has been amended to include: “detecting an event comprising a plurality of participants and storing an event profile” and “receiving content relating to the event from one of the plurality of participants”. As discussed above, Bellwood et al. does not disclose receiving content relating an event from a participant of the event. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Bellwood et al. does not anticipate independent claim 25, and therefore, are in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

9. Claims 17-18 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. U.S. Patent No. 2004/0064835 A1 (Bellwood et

al.), and in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0103813 A1 (Frigon et al.). Applicants respectfully submit one of ordinary skill in the art would not combine the teachings of Bellwood et al. with the teachings of Frigon et al., as references are not analogous art, and Bellwood does not disclose any suggestion that the system and methods disclosed apply to content produced by the viewer of the television program, instead, it specifically teaches that the content involved is on-demand video from cable companies. (See Bellwood et al. Abstract, and paragraphs 0009-0014). Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 17-19 and 24, for at least this reason, are not anticipated by Bellwood et al. in view of Frigon et al.

However, as stated above Applicants have cancelled claims 15-19 without prejudice, and thus, this rejection is no longer applicable. Additionally, as described above, Applicants have amended independent claim 20, and because claim 24 depends on claim 20, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection: claim 24 is allowable for at least the same reasons as stated above in reference to claim 20.

10. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. in view of U.S. Patent No. 2004/0064835 A1 (Bellwood et al.), and in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0003330 A1 (Asgarinejad et al.). As stated above, Applicants have cancelled claim 19 without prejudice, and thus, this rejection is no longer applicable.


CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that the above amendments and remarks place the pending claims in a condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _____

1/5/2006



Thomas F. Lebens
Reg. No. 38,221

Address all correspondence to:
FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY
120 So. LaSalle Street, Ste. 1600
Chicago, IL 60603

Direct telephone inquiries to:
Thomas F. Lebens
120 So. LaSalle Street, Ste. 1600
Chicago, IL 60603
(805) 781-2865